

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 08/30/2004

APPLICATION NO	.]	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/650,091	·	08/28/2003	Joseph Francis Perret JR.	BLTC001/00US	5984	
22903	7590	08/30/2004		EXAMINER		
COOLEY	GODW	ARD LLP	SCHWARTZ, CHRISTOPHER P			
ATTN: PA	TENT GF	ROUP				
11951 FRE	EDOM D	RIVE, SUITE 1700	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
ONE FREEDOM SQUARE- RESTON TOWN CENTER				3683		
RESTON,	VA 201	90-5061				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	\neg			
Office Action Summer.	10/650,091	PERRET ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Christopher P. Schwartz	3683				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	e correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	i6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) fill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fr cause the application to become ABANDO	timely filed days will be considered timely. om the mailing date of this communication. NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	_•					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☒ This	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11,	453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	vn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.					
Application Papers		·				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ acce	epted or b) objected to by th	e Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti	on is required if the drawing(s) is	objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Offi	ce Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	(a)-(d) or (f).				
 Certified copies of the priority documents 						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior		ived in this National Stage				
application from the International Bureau	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	•					
		STRAWN	-			
• · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		ary (PTO-413) CHRISTOPHER P. SCHWART Date	- 11			
Attachment(s)	∆ □	CHRISTOPHERY EXAMIN				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) 🔲 Interview Summa Paper No(s)/Mail	Date	\mathcal{Y}			
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Informa	Il Patent Application (PTO-152)				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3</u> . S. Patent and Trademark Office	6)	\ \undersigned \				

PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04)

The information disclosure statement has been received and considered.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to because it appears figure 1 should be labeled as "prior art". Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3683

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Engalitcheff, Jr. '957 in view of applicant's prior art disclosure of calibration methods on pages 2 and 3 and figure 1 of the drawings and McIntosh.

Regarding claim 1 Engalitcheff, Jr. ('957) discloses a device similar to applicants. From the abstract the braking force or "preselected resistance" may be applied via electrical, pneumatic, hydraulic or mechanical means and the resistance may be varied.

'957 lacks any specific calibration technique for the applied resistance force to the device and the processor and memory.

Applicants describe in their specification at pages 2 and 3 and show in figure 1 two calibration techniques known in the art, namely the average calibration method and the adjusted average calibration method.

McIntosh is relied upon to teach the idea of using a computer or processor and memory in controlled variable resistance exercise systems which are applicable to rehabilitative programs (col. 3 line 49).

The skilled worker in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to have employed either of these known calibration methods to the device of '957 to calibrate the required user output force to move the shaft to a desired user input value dependent upon the level of desired resistive force by the user and to have further modified the device to include a processor and memory so that the calibration technique may be "upgraded", or "tailored" for specific performance, or to retain specific customized setting information for a specific user.

Since the prior art calibration techniques described by applicant conceivably include multiple input and output values, to be or which are "averaged", the requirements of claims 1-20, as broadly claimed, are considered to be met.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The prior art has been cited for showing other types of variable resistance exercise systems.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher P. Schwartz whose telephone number is 703-308-0576. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30-6:00.

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Page 5

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack W. Lavinder can be reached on 703-308-3421. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Cps 8/26/04